

funds have been set aside to be used only for this purpose.

Again we heard the familiar theme that our aid was geared to self-help. We were given a few examples in a few countries to buttress this contention. It is significant, however, that we heard nothing about the use of the Joint Commission on Rural Development that was initiated by our former colleague, Walter Judd, and used so successfully in Taiwan. It brings local officials into association with our personnel in the planning and execution of rural programs. Last year Congress broadened the language in the expectation that it would be used more widely. Certainly this is self-help. Why has AID not availed itself of this tested device to hasten its self-help program? We just wonder at some of these things they have not attended to.

For more than a decade I have urged our officials to devote more attention to Africa—a continent of hope and frustration, of opportunity and unfulfilled ambitions. Often I have felt like a lonely pleader. A bit perhaps like Billy Graham, I can say that "I have no knowledge that the CIA has helped finance any of my crusades." Only sheer persistence particularly by Congress has moved the executive branch to shift into higher gear on Africa.

Last year the executive made a study and a report on Africa that I find very disturbing. It was not told the committee. It was an executive branch report that was marked "confidential," pretty much top secret. It was impossible to get it. Some far-reaching recommendations with serious policy implications were contained in it. If adopted as the official policy of our Government, Congress would be called upon to implement it. It was prepared by a former Ambassador to Ethiopia but it does not represent the judgment of many of our Ambassadors to African states who have considerably more expertise in matters pertaining to Africa. The gist of the report was that greater emphasis be placed upon the use of multilateral agencies in the development of that continent, and give to regions, not just to single states. Admittedly there are some programs that can best be handled on a multilateral basis. We can handle them that way, but these are relatively few.

To urge, even to insist upon, nations still seeking national identity to forsake that goal for untested and precarious approaches to regional development is to expect too much too soon. We must never forget that modest bilateral programs can have a far-reaching political as well as economic impact on these countries. Furthermore, our bilateral programs carry with them policy considerations that are in our national interest.

Foreign assistance is more than assistance by our Government to other governments. It involves tapping the total of our human and material resources which in the United States often lie in private hands. From the beginning of our legislative efforts we have always included in the annual foreign aid bill provisions to stimulate the use of these private resources. This bill is no exception. The investment guaranty program now in law is extended and strengthened

in this bill, thus making possible the greater availability of the managerial and technical skills of our citizens. Members should note that this program has been highly successful, if not as highly publicized as other parts of the program. Through 1966 our Government has paid out only \$300,000 against a total reserve of about \$300 million.

In 26 years of service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been a participant in, and a witness to, many legislative battles on matters pertaining to our foreign relations. I have served in time of peace and in times of war, both hot and cold. I am aware of the deep emotional concerns that foreign assistance stirs among our citizens.

Foreign assistance cannot be characterized in simple words like "good" or "bad." It contains within itself many implications for our Nation, not only for today, but for the future. It has obvious deficiencies and shortcomings. Your committee has applied itself diligently to overcoming these as they have become apparent. No statistical chart can depict either its successes or failures. These have to be determined in the sum total of our foreign policy goals. At the same time, we have to balance these goals against our resources.

Those who would urge its termination have a burden to prove that it is not responsive to our national interests even in times of national fiscal difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I want to say from my heart. When we deal with these other countries, it seems to me that we become a little too eager to tell them what to do and how to do it. We do it from the top. We ought to do it from the heartfelt standards of life. What people care about is what we care about in them. They do not want to know what we think is so perfect, because it is not perfect. When we try to make them do things we think are right, perhaps those things are not suited to them at all. So I have tried to urge at every possible opportunity that we try to give the other countries this understanding. Let me divert myself for just a moment at this point. People do not like to ask for help. When they have had it given them, they are apt to turn away from the friends who have given it. Let us not forget that. Let us not become impatient when those things happen to us in the national area.

I hope very much that the House is going to pass this bill. I have found myself sometimes wishing it would not, just wondering what would happen if we did not pass it. But I have come here today to vote for the bill, and I shall hope exceedingly much that the Congress will pass it with a sufficient majority to make it really useful in more ways than one.

I have served many years here with various chairmen and various members of the committee. I find it quite impossible to sit down without saying "Thank you" to Dr. MORGAN for his patience. The man is very patient. We put him through terrible things sometimes in the committee—do we not?—and he is so gracious and so quiet. He does not snap back at us and he could do so many times. I see that many, many Members agree with me. He has discharged his responsibilities as he saw them with skill. For my colleagues on the minority side, I

want to express to him our very deep appreciation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I do urge that this body support this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967.

At the outset, I should like to compliment our distinguished chairman, Dr. MORGAN, for the endless patience and high degree of statesmanship which he demonstrated during our committee's consideration of this legislation.

It is seldom, Mr. Chairman, that a committee of the Congress spends 4 months working on a single legislative bill. Yet this is precisely what happened this year with the foreign assistance legislation. We began holding hearings on April 4 and we reported the bill on August 11.

TRIBUTE TO THE CHAIRMAN

During that entire time, Dr. MORGAN did everything in his power to assure a comprehensive examination of the foreign aid program, and to give all members of the committee—both the majority and the minority—every possible opportunity to summon and question expert witnesses.

I pay my tribute to Mrs. BOLTON who cooperated with our chairman—and who made sure we were all in the act together.

If anyone should complain about lack of information relating to the foreign aid program—how it operates and what it has accomplished—it is not because the opportunity to obtain such information has been lacking.

There are detailed presentations prepared by the Agency for International Development and the military departments—presentations which examine the program in detail, country by country.

There are unclassified summary presentations which run into hundreds of pages and which were made available to all Members of Congress.

There is the record of the hearings held before our committee—a record which fills nearly 1,400 pages of print.

There is a 137-page report submitted by our committee which describes in detail each and every provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 in addition to dealing with the major issues of the overall program.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to the excellent remarks of our chairman, Dr. MORGAN, made at the outset of this debate, which contain a fund of valuable information about this program.

I shall not attempt to duplicate any of those sources. Instead, in rising in support of H.R. 12048, I should like to underline several considerations which argue on behalf of this legislation.

CUTS IN THE PROGRAM

The first point relates to the reductions made in the foreign aid authorization by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Our committee cut the fiscal 1968 au-